

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3, and various dependent claims, have been rejected as being anticipated by Rosenkranc (US 6,276,061). The remaining dependent claims have been rejected as being unpatentable over Rosenkranc. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants will discuss this rejection as it applies to independent claims 1 and 3 in turn.

Applicants' claim 1 requires a rear wall having a rear exterior surface extending downward at the back of the housing to a terminating surface, and a trimming blade having a trimming cutting edge extending at least partially beyond said terminating surface inside of an imaginary extension of the rear exterior surface, the rear exterior surface defining a trimming cap for the trimming blade. An example of such a construction is shown in Fig. 9, in which the cutting edge 536 of blade 504 extends at least partially beyond a terminating surface 526 of rear wall 506 and is inside of an imaginary extension of rear wall 506, such that wall 506 defines a trimming cap 535 for the blade. This arrangement avoids cutting of the user's skin during handling of the cartridge and razor, as discussed at p. 6, lines 18-20 of Applicant's specification.

Rosenkranc does not provide any enabling teaching or suggestion of such an arrangement. Rosenkranc does not provide sufficient views to allow the reader to determine the geometry of the rear wall of the housing in Rosenkranc's cartridge. There is no indication that the cutting edge of the trimming blade extends beyond a terminating surface of the rear wall, nor that the cutting edge is inside of an imaginary extension of a terminating surface of the rear wall. Accordingly, Rosenkranc cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 1 or the claims that depend therefrom.

Applicants' claim 3 requires a trimming assembly attached to the housing. The trimming assembly includes (a) a trimming blade having a trimming cutting edge and (b) a trimming guard in a predetermined position with respect to the trimming cutting edge to define a trimming blade span and a trimming blade angle. An example of such a trimming assembly is shown in Figs. 9 and 10. Trimming blade 504 is welded to the rear wall 506 of blade carrier 502, while trimming guard 528 extends from lower wall 512 of the blade carrier. Thus, the cutting edge 536 of the trimming blade is held in a precise, predetermined position with respect to the trimming guard,

as discussed in Applicants' specification at page 5, lines 21-25. Including a trimming blade and a trimming guard on a common assembly that is attached to a housing of a shaving razor blade unit facilitates accurate positioning of the trimming guard with respect to the trimming blade to provide accurate trimming blade tangent angle and trimming blade span. (Applicants' Specification, p. 6, lines 20-23.)

Rosenkranc does not include a trimming assembly as recited in Applicants' claim 3. Rosenkranc does not teach or remotely suggest a trimming guard that is attached to the housing, much less a trimming assembly that is attached to the housing and includes a trimming guard in a predetermined position with respect to the trimming cutting edge. The Examiner apparently construes a portion of Rosenkranc's housing to be a trimming guard. Assuming for the sake of argument that a portion of the housing acts as a guard, which Applicants do not concede, nonetheless this integral portion of the housing is necessarily not attached to the housing, nor is it part of a trimming assembly that includes the trimming blade. Thus, Rosenkranc cannot anticipate or render obvious claim 3 or the claims that depend therefrom.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under §§102 and 103 be withdrawn.

The Examiner notes that a certified copy of the priority document has not been submitted. The undersigned is endeavoring to obtain the certified copy and will submit it under separate cover as soon as possible.

Applicants believe that no fees are due with this response. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 00216-661001.

Applicant : Evan Pennell et al,
Serial No. : 10/798,864
Filed : March 11, 2004
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 00216-661001 / Case 8131

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 14, 2005

for: Catherine M. McCarty Reg. No. 54,301
Celia H. Leber
Reg. No. 33,524

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21152489.doc

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 3, 5, 7, 9, 10 and 15 and replace the original sheets including Fig. 3-7, 9-10, 14 and 15.

In these figures, various reference numbers have been added and corrected to conform the drawings to the specification. Changes are indicated in red on the annotated sheets.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheets (4 pages)
Annotated Sheets Showing Change(s) (4 pages)




FIG. 4



FIG. 5




FIG. 6




FIG. 7




FIG. 9




FIG. 10




FIG. 14




FIG. 15

